

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 1-24 and 27- 28 were rejected. By the present Response, claims 1 and 17 are amended and claim 28 is canceled. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-24 and 27 will remain pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. By the present response claim 28 is canceled.

The Examiner argued that claim 1 requires the flow director does not extend over the exit site of the film cooling hole and that the Examiner was not able to locate proper support in the specification for such negative limitation.

Applicants submit that the support for this limitation can be found at paragraphs [0027], [0033] and Fig. 3 of the application. For example, text from [0033] is set forth below:

"The flow modifier 30 is described in greater detail with reference to Figures 3-7 and 17. For the embodiment illustrated in Figure 3, the flow modifier 30 is situated on the hot surface 22 of wall 12 and does not extend over the exit site 16. The flow modifier 30 may be formed in a variety of shapes. Exemplary flow modifier shapes are shown in Figures 4-7 and include a rounded flow modifier (Figure 6). Triangular flow modifiers 30 are illustrated in Figures 4 and 7, and a trapezoidal flow modifier is shown in Figure 5 (collectively "polygonal flow modifiers"). The rounded flow modifiers 30 may be circular (as shown) or elliptical in cross-section. Further, although the flow modifiers 30 are shown as regular shapes (circles, triangles etc) for simplicity, the flow modifiers 30 may also be irregularly shaped."

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to remove this rejection.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office Action summarizes claims 1-5, 10-20 and 23 and 27 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bunker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,234,755; hereinafter “Bunker”). Further, claims 1-5, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Haselbach (U.S. Patent No. 6,817,833). Rejected claims 1 and 17 are independent and will be discussed in detail below.

By the present response independent claims 1 and 17 are amended and claim 28 is canceled. Independent claims 1 and 17 and the claims depending there from are believed to be patentable for the reasons summarized below.

**Claims 1 and 17**

Amended claim 1 recites a method for forming a *plurality of discrete flow directors* on a component comprising a wall having at least one film-cooling hole extending through the wall and defining an exit site, *wherein at least one of the flow directors is associated with respective one of the at least one film cooling hole*, said method comprising depositing at least one layer on the wall of the component, wherein said deposition includes shaping the at least one layer in accordance with a predetermined shape to form each of the flow directors that extends outwards from the wall of the component and through hot gas flow path to direct a coolant flowing from the film-cooling hole toward a hot surface of the wall, *wherein the flow director does not extend over the exit site*.

Amended claim 17 recites a method for forming a *plurality of discrete flow directors* on a turbine component comprising a wall having a cold surface and a hot

surface, wherein at least one film-cooling hole extends through the wall for flowing a coolant from the cold surface to the hot surface, the film-cooling hole defining an exit site in the hot surface of the wall, *wherein at least one of the flow directors is associated with respective one of the at least one film cooling hole*, said method comprising:

depositing at least one layer on the wall of the component, wherein said deposition includes shaping the at least one layer in accordance with a predetermined shape to form each of the flow directors that extends outwards from the wall of the component and through hot gas flow path to direct the coolant flowing from the film-cooling hole toward the hot surface of the wall, *wherein the flow director does not extend over the exit site.*

Applicants thus submit that amended independent claims 1, and 17 recite, in generally similar language, forming a plurality a plurality of discrete flow directors, wherein at least one of the flow directors is associated with respective one of the at least one film cooling hole. Each of the flow director extends outwards from the wall of the component and through hot gas flow path to direct the coolant flowing from the film-cooling hole toward the hot surface of the wall, wherein the flow director does not extend over the exit site. *See Application, paragraphs [0027], [0033] [0037],Fig. 1 and Fig. 3.*

The Examiner argued that Bunker discloses a method of forming a flow director (by forming a slot over the holes) on a component comprising a wall by depositing at least one layer on the wall of the component, wherein said deposition includes shaping the layers in accordance with the predetermined shape of the flow director and therefore forming the flow director that extends radially outwards from the initial wall of the component and into a hot gas flow path . The Examiner cited passages at col. 2, lines 20-24 and lines 50-60 and Fig. 3in support of the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bunker fails to teach a plurality of discrete flow directors wherein at least one of the flow directors is associated with respective one of the

at least one film cooling hole. Rather, Bunker teaches forming a continuous slot over the cooling holes within a high temperature surface of the substrate.

Bunker teaches a slot that would extend partly inwardly and perpendicularly from each hot surface toward the cooler surface. The slot also extends longitudinally along a selected dimension of holes. Further, the slot serves as a spillway trench for coolant air exiting cooling holes. *See*, Bunker, col. 6, lines 27-35 and col. 7, lines 1-10. Clearly, Bunker does not teach discrete flow directors, with at least one flow director associated with each cooling hole that is extending outwards from the surface and not extending over the exit site. Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be supported by Bunker against claims 1 and 17.

With regard to amended independent claim 1, Haselbach does not teach a plurality of discrete flow directors, wherein the flow director does not extend over an exit site of the cooling hole. Haselbach teaches a turbine blade having at least one cooling excavation. The cooling excavation extends into a surface of the turbine blade with a mouth. In the area of mouth a protrusion is provided that extends over a circumferential area of the mouth. Further, the protrusion may preferably feature a cross-sectional area projecting into the mouth. As can be seen, Haselbach does not disclose a flow director that extends outwards from the wall of the component and does not extend over the exit site of a cooling hole. Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be supported by Haselbach against claim 1.

Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 17 and their dependent claims are allowable and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider rejection of the claim.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action summarizes claims 6-9, 21 and 22 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunker in view of Sabol et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,060,174).

Claims 6-9, 21 and 22 depend from independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that insomuch as independent claims 1 and 17 are allowable, these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

**Conclusion**

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2007

/Patrick K. Patnode/  
Patrick K. Patnode  
Reg. No. 40,121  
General Electric Company  
Building K1, Room 3A52a  
Niskayuna, New York 12309  
Telephone: (518) 387-5286